

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 3, and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yasuda (US 4,413,256).

Claims 1, 6-9, and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hanano (US 6,535,194).

Claims 2-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanano in view of Matsumoto (US 4,097,128).

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanano in view of Yamamoto (US 4,926,168).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, and 13 to further define the invention, and amended claim 3 to correct a grammatical error. Accordingly, claims 1-14 are pending for further consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 3, and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yasuda (US 4,413,256), claims 1, 6-9, and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hanano (US 6,535,194), claims 2-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanano in view of Matsumoto (US 4,097,128), and claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanano in view of Yamamoto (US 4,926,168). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a liquid crystal display device and independent claim 7, as amended, recites an apparatus for driving a liquid crystal display, both including a

light shutter operable to transmit and shut off a light emitted from the liquid crystal display panel during one field period, “wherein the one field period is initiated upon transition of a gate signal from a low voltage signal to a high voltage signal.” Similarly, independent claim 13, as amended, recites a method of driving a liquid crystal display device having a light shutter including a step of “opening the light shutter at an initial interval upon application of the video data and closing the light shutter in a maintenance interval maintaining the video data to shut off a light from the liquid crystal display panel.”

In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention, Yasuda et al. is completely silent with regard to operational characteristics of a light shutter with respect to transitioning of gate signals. In addition, Hanano et al. explicitly teaches (col. 12, 49 to col. 13, line 6, and as shown in FIGs. 4(a) to 4(g)) that control signals for turning ON and OFF a light shutter 2 are delayed with respect to image signals (i.e., data and gate voltages). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Yasuda et al. and Hanano et al. fail to teach or suggest the combination of features recited by amended independent claims 1, 7, and 13, and hence dependent claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14.

In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office Action does not rely upon Matsumoto and/or Yamamoto for remedying the deficiencies of either of Yasuda et al. or Hanano et al. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Office Action cannot rely upon Matsumoto and/or Yamamoto for remedying the deficiencies of either of Yasuda et al. or Hanano et al. since neither Matsumoto nor Yamamoto teaches or suggests operational characteristics of a light shutter, as recited by amended independent claims 1, 7, and 13, and hence dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-14 are neither taught nor suggested by the applied prior art references, whether taken alone or in

combination. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§§ 102(b), 102(e), and 103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combination of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

CONCLUSION

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Eric J. Nuss
Registration No. 40,106

Dated: August 17, 2005

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant